

## Appendix B

### Scoping Responses Received During the 30-Day Comment Period

#### Content Analysis

The following table is the result of a comprehensive review of the comments that were received during the 30-Day Comment Period for Scoping. A copy of the original comments is located in the Project File. While the IDT considered all of the comments that were received, how the comments were incorporated into the analysis process varied type. The following descriptions apply to the categories of comments that are illustrated in *Table B.1: Summary of Comments Received*.

*Alt (Alternative):* These were comments that were received on the proposed action that were within the Purpose and Need and were specific enough to be included as part of one or more of the alternatives for the project. This section also includes those comments that were received that may have been considered as a viable alternative, but were eliminated from detailed analysis for one or more reasons. Where these were addressed in the document is identified by page number or alternative.

*Non-substantive:* These were comments that may or may not have been within the stated Purpose and Need for the project. They were general in nature and did not provide specific recommendations for altering the proposed action. These comments were not included as part of the analysis for this project.

*Effects:* These were comments showing specific concerns or recommendations about the environmental effects at the project level. These comments were addressed in the environmental effects portion of the document and are identified by the page number in the analysis where they are discussed.

*Mitigation:* These were comments that had specific concerns or recommendations about the environmental effects related to specific activities proposed. These were addressed through the development and incorporation of conservation measures during project implementation. This section refers to the section of the Appendix A where these are addressed. The conservation measures that apply to specific areas are identified in the Unit Cards (located in the Project File), available upon request.

*Beyond Scope:* There were comments that ranged from very specific to very general, but did not meet the Purpose and Need identified for this project. These comments were not incorporated into the analysis for this project.

Table B.1: Summary of Comments Received

General					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
1A. Adjust the timing of the Scoping Period.					X
1B. Cooperative involvement in habitat restoration with private property owners.			3-69		
1C. General support of the proposed project		X			
1D. General opposition to the proposed project		X			
1E. Effects to local agricultural producers			3-40		
1F. General support of taking no action within the Project Area.		X			
1G. Setting a realistic timeline for the creation/restoration of the savanna ecosystem in this area.			3-53		
1H. Account for the restoration work already begun in the Newaygo Experimental Forest.			3-39		
1I. Impacts of this project on civil rights.			3-218		
1J. Development of a public educational/awareness program on the KBB and the restoration activities.				A-8	
1K. Consideration for the enforcement that would be necessary to protect the investments involved in this project.			3-163		
1L. The impacts of the proposed activities on private property.			3-211		
1M. Misrepresentation of the project in SOPA Report.		X			
1N. Incomplete and vague maps		X			
1O. Opposition to the expansion of any Old Growth management within the Project Area.					X
1P. Consider areas more suitable for habitat creation, rather than existing forests.			3-10		
Recreation					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
2A. The effects of concentrating horse use in the area from dispersed (existing) to a single trail (proposed)			3-150 3-164		
2B. Consideration of a gated system for the proposed road closures that could be opened during the time when impacts to the KBB would be lessened.					X
2C. Opposed to the closure of the snowmobile trail that would occur with the closure of the road in Otto Township.			3-167		
2D. More areas should be developed for snowmobile use.					X
2E. General support for the proposed horse trail in the WRSPNMA.		X			
2F. General opposition for the horse trail in the WRSPNMA.		X			
2G. More opportunities should be provided for horseback riding.					X
2H. Within the WRSPNMA, use of the closed Forest Roads by horses should be included in the proposed trail system.			3-163		
2I. The number of proposed campsites (13) will not be enough to support the number of people that utilize the area for camping.			3-166		

Table B.1 (continued): Summary of Comments Received

Recreation (continued)					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
2J. Larger camping sites should be provided to accommodate group camping.			3-150, 3-153, and 3-163		
2K. Give consideration to providing locations that would allow horse access to drinking water.			3-166		
2L. Specific recommendations to the design of the horse trail within the WRSPNMA.					
2L-1. In addition to the development of a parking area, allow for parking of horse rigs to occur at the historic parking spot (just west of Pines Point).			3-149 3-164		
2L-2. Open up the clearing off of 168 <sup>th</sup> by gating 9354 and 9014G, leaving the entire area of the inner loop of 90141 open for group camping.			3-163 3-164		
2L-3. Designate a multiple-day use horse camp.					X
2L-4 Allow for the connection of the horse trail to the far east end of Winston Road.	Map 3.11, pp. 3-163				
2L-5 Open FR5306 to connect the south end of 160 <sup>th</sup> avenue to the non-motorized trail along the river.	Map 3.11, pp. 3-163				
2L-6 Incorporate 9011Q and 9319 into the trail to connect to 152 Avenue to the north.	Map 3.11, pp. 3-163				
2M. Provide for more motorized access throughout the area for hunting/fishing/camping.					X
2N. Provide for motorized access that would allow for the put-in and take-out of canoes within the WRSPNMA.					X
2O. Leave the WRSPNMA open to horses	Alt 1 and 2				
2P. Increase the size of the proposed parking area for horse users		X			
2Q. Project will result in reduced recreation with the WRSPNMA.			3-164		
2R. General Opposition to the concept of "Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized Areas".					X
2S. Effects of winter snowmobile use on the Karner blue butterfly			3-65, 66, 68, 78		
2T. Open the trail within the WRSPNMA to snowmobiles during the winter months.			3-167		
2U. Give consideration to winter recreation activities within the Project Area.			3-167		

Table B.1 (continued): Summary of Comments Received

Transportation					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
3A. Specific recommendations for the management of the road system within the Project Area (see road specific comments section).					
3A-1. Opposed to the closing of the Forest Road #5295 from Winston Road to Forest Road #5637.					X
3A-2. Provide wooded buffer zones along the roads as an alternative to closure.				A-4 and 6	
3A-3. Develop the dispersal corridors along the portions of the roads with tight turns to avoid interference with the KBB by fast-moving vehicles.				A -7	
3A-4. Proposal of a White River Semi-Primitive Scenic Driving Route, including the following roads to be left open: FR7992, FR9011Q, FR5306, The east-west spur from 152 Ave to the Hopeton campsite, The FR9011Q spur to the Eastside campsite, The spur to the Rockmill campsite, FR9012U, FR9314, FR9010R, FR5306, The road labeled FR5307 on the above map but labeled FR9045 on the MVUM, FR9353, FR 9013J, FR9364, FR5295, the two spurs north of FR9364 going from FR5295 ESE to the White River, and the road in the upper right corner of the above map going by the Pines Point Campground. The WRSPSDR proposal includes 16 designated camping areas along the White River.	2-8				
3A-5. In Otto, leave open 9310 and 9309 in their entirety.	Alt 1 and 2				
3A-6. In Otto, include on MVUM some of the existing spurs that lead to the main branch of the White River and the associated camping areas.					X
3A-7. In Otto include on MVUM an existing closed road of approximately 2 miles from the intersection of McKinley and 128 <sup>th</sup> Ave ENE to 142 <sup>nd</sup> Ave.					X
See Map 3 from Pat Brower to identify the location of the following comments:					
3A-8. (I): Close user-developed campsite to prevent illegal dumping.					X
3A-9. (II): Barricade "Dry Wash" area to prevent illegal ORV use.					X
3A-10. (III): Close user-developed campsite to prevent illegal dumping.					X
3A-11. (IV): Restore access to Forest Road blocked by private landowner.					X
3A-12. (V): Leave turn-around parking area open at the top of the hill, stabilize and rehabilitate the original logging road, and add it to MVUM. Use barrier posts to prevent the expansion/development of hill climbs.					X
3A-13. (VI): Close user-developed campsite.					X
3A-14. (VII): Add existing road to MVUM and leave camping site open.					X



Table B.1 (continued): Summary of Comments Received

Transportation (continued)					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
3A-15. (VIII): Utilize barrier posts to define a suitable campsite and parking area. Obstruct access to the valley slope and repair the damaged hillside.					X
3A-16. (IX): Close user-developed campsite to prevent illegal dumping.					X
3A-17. (X): Close user-developed campsite to prevent illegal dumping.					X
3A-18. (XI): Close user-developed campsite.					X
3A-19. (XII): On the road to Poison Springs, leave open to the T intersection. Block the western portion of the road from the T intersection, leaving enough room for vehicle parking. Leave the eastern portion of the T intersection open and add a culvert to allow passage over an existing low portion of the road. Add the open portion to the next publication of the MVUM.					X
3A-20. (XIII): Leave FR9309 open to the hillslope/access site and designate as a camping area. Close user-created access points from the backside of the hill utilizing barrier posts and the existing "ring of trees" that exist. In addition, leave the field in this area accessible to vehicles, as it serves as a secondary camping area for those that are not able to access the preferred site in this area.					X
3A-21. (XIV): Leave this connector loop open and add to the next publication of MVUM.					X
3A-22. (XV): Leave this camping site open (associated with the road segment discussed in XIV).					X
3A-23. (XVI): Re-position the riverside rock barriers to prevent the creep of this campsite down river.					X
3A-24. (XVII): Leave the connector between this site and the Logging camp open and included on the next publication of MVUM.					X
3A-25. (XVIII): Designate as a camping area.					X
3A-26. (XIX): Designate as a camping area.					X
3A-27. (XX): Construct a connecting spur between FR9312 and FR9872.					X
3A-28. (XXII): Designate the existing closed road from 128 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to Kent Road as open and include it on the next publication of MVUM.	3-200				
3A-29. Short of a designated WRSPDR, opposed to the closure of FR7992, FR5306, and FR5307 within the SPNMA.					X

Table B.1 (continued): Summary of Comments Received

Transportation (continued)					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
3A-30. Support the use of rocks and boulders over wooden barrier posts.				A-6	
3B. General support for the proposed road closures.		X			
3C. General opposition for the proposed road closures.		X			
3D. How the project would impact motorized access to existing private property within the Project Area.			3-195		
3E. Allow more motorized access within the Project Area.	2-8				
3F. Question the need for closure of Forest Roads in light of the proximity of the proposed activities to high-use county-maintained roads.			3-183		
3G. Road closures will increase illegal ATV use.			3-163		
3H. Address the amount of land area of roads, compared with the amount of land area of the proposed activities.			3-130		
3I. Effects of road closures on the ability to suppress wildfires.			3-198		
3J. Effects of road closures on illegal activities (meth labs, marijuana cultivation, etc.)			3-163		
3K. The effects that the road closures will have on concentrating road use and recreation.			3-163		
3L. Designate some of the roads in the Otto area for High-Clearance Vehicles.					X
Economics					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
4A. Impacts of the proposed project on the economy.			3-211		
4B. Quantifying the cost of implementing the project.			3-206 and 209		
4C. Impacts of the proposed activities on the property values of adjacent landowners.					X
4D. Managing the timber resource for profit.					X
Vegetation Management					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
5A. The effects of prescribed burning on climate change.			3-116		
5B. Continued access to firewood cutting units.			3-9		
5C. Measures required to deal with the stump sprouting and suckering that would occur due to the harvesting of oak/aspen types.			3-10 and 11		
5D. Timeline for harvesting (all at once vs. spread out over the length of the project timeline).			3-11		

Vegetation Management (continued)					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
5E. Concern over the change in typing from forested to non-forested.	Alt 1				
5F. Support seeding and planting using local genotypes via local contractors.			3-21		
5G. Convert more pine types to savanna, compared to oak or aspen.			3-10		
5H. Augment savanna creation with traditional timber sales.		X			
5I. Seek opportunities to regenerate aspen.	Alt 2 and 3				
5J. Reduce hazardous fuels in wildland/urban interface.	Alt 2 and 3				
Wildlife					
Description	Alt	Non-Substantive	Effects	Mitigation	Beyond Scope
6A. Determining at what point the KBB has recovered.			3-52		
6B. Include a discussion of other early-successional species.			3-82		
6C. Considering the impacts that the deer population would have on lupine and on the efforts to restore savanna habitat.			3-62		
6D. Impacts that the creation of savanna would have on poaching.			3-85		
6E. Impacts that the proposed projects would have on late-successional species.			3-101		
6F. FOIA Request for KBB survey information.	Information provided				
6G. Assess the potential for Indiana bats to be impacted by the proposed project			3-101		
6H. Assess the potential for KBB to be impacted by the proposed project.			3-101		
6I. Consult the applicable guidelines for activities associated with the proposed project that may impact wetlands or bald eagles.				A-3 and 11	
6J. Opposition to Single-Species Management			3-81		
6K. Opposition to savanna creation in attainment of the 20,000 acre goal of the HMNF Plan.					X

**This page left intentionally blank.**